

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1851.

In making up clubs for the *National Era*, it is not required that subscribers shall all be at the same post office.

Persons sending us clubs can always make additions to the same at the regular club prices.

No receipts are sent from this office. As our terms are strictly cash in advance, the receipt of the paper will be a sufficient acknowledgment that the money has been received.

A subscriber in Crawfordsville, Indiana, sends us two dollars, but does not give his name.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

Our grateful acknowledgments are due to the numerous friends who have engaged in extending our subscription list. In some cases, they go so far in their zeal for the cause we advocate, as to advance the money for subscriptions they obtain, agreeing to wait until it can be repaid, by those whom they thus favor. Some leave their business for a day or two, or more, which they generously devote to the task of procuring subscribers. One subscriber, a few days since, sent from Adrian, Michigan, forty subscribers, all new, except eight. From Worcester, Mass., owing to the exertions of three disinterested friends in that place, we have, within a few days, received upwards of a hundred new subscribers. Merely mention these cases as illustrative of the efficient agencies by which we are sustained. Nor is this all, the hundreds of letters that bring us the names of new and old subscribers, contain more decided, heartier approbation of our course than we have ever before received.

All this is gratifying to us personally, and also as an evidence of the increasing interest in the great question to which the *Era* is consecrated. Judging from our extensive correspondence, we should say that the supporters of the cause of freedom have not only increased in numbers, but in the fervor of their devotion.

TREASON TRIALS.

We give several columns this week to an account of the Treason Trials, now in progress at Philadelphia. The testimony is so contradictory, and the charges so frivolous, that it seems to be conceded on all hands, that whoever may have committed treason, he is innocent. The grand jury showed great folly, or something worse, when they indicted him. His deposition is alike all over the world. Here is a specimen of its quality—Count Guerrieri and Baron Lotti, of Verona, have been found guilty of high treason—the former for having received an anonymous letter, treating of the plans of the revolutionary party—the latter for having accepted an invitation to the house of Guerrieri, for the purpose of persuading, and afterwards burning, that letter. The sentence of the military court adjudged ten years' imprisonment in a fortress to the Count, and two years to the Baron; but Radetzky, it is said, has seen fit to diminish the period allotted in the sentence by one half, in the case of each.

Williams in Philadelphia is indicted for treason, because he communicated information to fugitive slaves, that a posse was on their track, and Hanway, because being present when the struggle took place between the slaves and slave-catchers, he refused to take part in it. The Italian Despot has far more to proceed upon than our American Republicans. The Italian offenders were sentenced merely to imprisonment, one for five years, the other for one. Our moral Government proposes to hang the Philadelphia offenders. American Despotism is more bloody in its demands than Italian. And yet we boast of our liberal institutions, our high civilization! The Federal Government and the Grand Jury of Philadelphia have disgraced the American People by this infamous attempt to bind and slay American citizens on the altar of Slavery.

RATIFICATION OF THE COMPROMISE.

The Union Whigs of the South are anxious to unite with the Democratic party in the approaching Presidential canvass, but upon such conditions as will fully justify their conduct to the Southern people generally. Proceeding on the assumption that the Whig party is not able to sustain effectually the policy of the Administration on the Slavery Question, in consequence of the controlling influence of Sewardism, they demand from the Democrats a complete endorsement of the Compromise and Fugitive Law, in all their Conventions. The introduction into the Democratic caucus of resolutions embracing such an endorsement, was in response to this demand, and how much the result grieved the heart of the National Union Whig may be learned from the speech of Mr. Cabell, of Florida, on the organization of the House, who avowed that he had come to Washington fully prepared to act with the Democrats, but that the conduct of the caucus had modified his views.

Mr. Foote is understood to represent the Union Compromise party of the South, headed by such men as Toombs, Stephens, and Cobb. Their policy, as we said, is to induce the adoption by the Democratic party in Congress and in National Conventions of resolutions ratifying the Compromise and Fugitive Law. Hence the introduction of Mr. Foote's resolutions in the Senate, and the intention to present similar resolutions in the House. Let the Democratic party in both branches adopt them with considerable unanimity, and the allied forces of Georgia and Mississippi of Compromise Democrats and Whigs will be satisfied. Their Union will be cemented; State Rights men and Secessionists, so called, be thrown overboard; Messrs. Foote, Cobb, Stephens, and Toombs, rally to the support of General Cass, who then, it is fondly hoped, may be able to defy the Free Soil Democrats. In this way, a new party, purged from Secessionism in the South and Free-Soilism in the North, will be organized, embracing Union Whigs and Democrats so called, represented by the Georgia patriots, Senator Foote, Mr. Cass, Mr. Webster, and other kindred spirits.

It may be asked why the Compromise Whigs of the South will not be satisfied with the action of the Whig caucus adopting the Adjutant measures? The explanation is obvious. They have at least the ordinary affection for offices, and besides, prefer a National Party wielding the power of a majority. But the Whig party see prostrated at the North. It has carried, we believe, in two States, Wisconsin and Vermont, and in them its policy is anything but agreeable to the Southern Whigs. Continued connection with a party broken up by the attempt to coerce its acquiescence in the Adjutant measures cannot be otherwise than disastrous. The Democratic party, they think, is in the ascendancy throughout the Union, so that if at their instance it will adopt in Congress and in National Conventions the Compromise and Fugitive Law, as a part of its platform, they can enter into an alliance with it, share some of the spoils, and make a merit of their conduct in the eyes of the South.

With this policy laid open, our readers will now understand the policy of the resolutions introduced by Mr. Foote, and to be introduced in the House—and they can also understand

the movements of the several parties in relation to them.

In the Senate, last Monday, they were taken up, and Mr. Foote delivered a written speech in their support. Mr. Butler, of South Carolina, took the floor in reply, and denounced the introduction of the resolutions. He seemed to regard it as an insult and wrong to those gentlemen in the South who had resisted the Compromise, as oppressive to the South.

Mr. Rhet then obtained the floor, and the Senate adjourned. Of the debate, we shall have more to say hereafter.

VERNON, November 29, 1851.

To the Editor of the *National Era*:
I chanced last evening to be in company with the authors of "The Reverses of an Old Maid," and Mr. Kossuth being the theme of conversation, I suggested to her to write a welcome to him, to be published in the *National Era*. This morning she sent me the following lines, which, unless my partiality for the writer misleads my critical judgment, are worthy of a place in your columns. I forward them in the hope that they may be in season for your next issue. If you publish, please print the signature, which is to be hereafter the *nomme de plume* of this lady.

For the *National Era*.

KOSUTH.

BY CATHERINE LEDYARD.

He is coming—he is coming—Kossuth, tried and true
Even now his ship is riding on the broad Atlantic
Every strong blast from the eastward brings him nearer
And nearer and nearer; but a few brief days of waiting, and the hero will be here!
Far more noble in disaster and defeat, the gallant Hun,
Than Napoleon, Alexander, on the proudest field of war;
They who fight for love of power, lust of gold, or hope of glory,
Blacken o'er the page of History with a dark and mournful story;
On their names the curse of thousands mingles with the world's loud praise.

But for those whose sword is wielded in the cause of Liberty

Liberty may be broken, and all the oppressed

That are free may be broken, and all the oppressed

Blessed is the strife they lead in—holly is the war they wage—

And their fame, in fadeless lustre, stars the darkness of their age.

Such art thou, heroic Magyar! and the deeds that thou hast done

Set thee by side with Hampden, Hoer, Tell, and Washington!

What though now the Austrian Vulture gloats upon the hump of slain,

And is lost, for now, the battle—it was never fought in vain.

Let him fly his gory pinions, utter his warlike cries;

For a single warrior fallen, shall a hundred warriors rise.

Once again the shout of victory from the Magyar shall be heard,

And the arrow of destruction shall bring down the cruel bird.

Welcome Kossuth! welcome chieftain, spirit-fellow and free!

Let us pledge the glorious present, and the past's proud memory.

Honor to the living heroes! honor to the brave who have kept their faith unshaken, each his trust has guarded well.

For wrongs that these have suffered, for what they may yet endure,

Be the vengeance quick and whelming, the reward be swift and sure.

Long enough has ancient Tyranny held stern and bloody sway;

Let it perish—let it perish—and we all shall breathe the free day.

Let it come through fields of carnage, seas of slaughter—better far

Than the slow death of oppression all the massacre of war!

Let it reign till Hungary's soil, home of the true and brave,

Freer than our own America, bears not a single slave.

FREE SOIL NATIONAL CONVENTION.

The National Convention of the Friends of Freedom that met at Cleveland, Ohio, in September, appointed a Committee to call a National Convention of Anti-Slavery voters, for the purpose of nominating candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency. For our own part, we prefer that National Conventions should be called in a more popular manner, that they should grow out of the action of People's Conventions in the several States. But as its members are among the most reliable of the friends of freedom, there is an obvious propriety in co-operating with its movements. The Chairman, we understand, has lately addressed a letter to the members, asking their opinion as to the time and place of holding the Convention, and also as to the form of the call that should be issued. A considerable number of the members being in Washington, they met a few days since, with several of our best friends in Congress, to confer upon the subject. There was great unanimity of opinion, and the conclusions to which they came will be communicated, we are informed, to the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Lewis, of Cincinnati.

We learn that no doubt existed as to the propriety of such a Convention. With one exception, we believe, all concurred in the belief that the action of the old parties would be such as to render independent nominations necessary. But they were unanimously of the opinion that the Convention should be held after the Conventions of those parties, not that they had any doubt as to the nature of their action, but they held that the American People would be better prepared to decide their course upon facts than upon presumptions.

As to the place, all but one agreed on Pittsburgh as their first choice, and Cleveland as their second. The one referred to preferred Cleveland first, next Pittsburgh.

They all desired that the determination to hold a National Convention should be proclaimed, and the subject kept steadily in view, though for reasons we suppose they will assign in their reply to the Chairman, they thought it best that the call itself should be postponed till after the old parties had made their nominations. The usual time for the meeting of the Whig and Democratic Conventions is in the latter part of May and first week in June.

It is to be hoped that the Committee may harmonize in opinion and action.

ILLINOIS.—The Free Democracy have called a Convention of the friends of Liberty to meet at Princeton, Bureau Co., Illinois, on Wednesday, 22d of January, 1852, for the nomination of candidates for Governor, Lt. Governor, Secretary of State, Auditor, and Treasurer, and electors of President and Vice President, and effect a thorough organization of the friends of Liberty for the State, and through all the counties. It is called as a mass convention of the people, opposed to slavery and the pro-slavery administration of the Government, and the Fugitive Slave Law, and the Compromise measures; and all persons of these views, and those who would have the Government of the country administered on the principles of justice, on which it is founded, without distinction of former parties, are requested to meet in the Convention, and form for the State a Free Democratic and True Liberty Party. *

KOSUTH, THE GOVERNMENT AND PEOPLE.

Kossuth has come. The People are honoring him as they should, though the Government has not as yet made up its mind what to do. Mr. Fillmore, who took the initiative in his release, by instructing the American Minister at Constantinople to intercede for it, now turns him over to Congress, fearful of receiving him, lest Austria and Russia might be offended. The Administration journals justify this policy, and on these grounds:

"It was both discreet and delicate (says the *Buffalo Commercial Advertiser*) to throw upon Congress the whole matter of the reception of Kossuth. It was Congress, and not the Executive, that invited Kossuth to this country; and it was by an act of Congress that a national ship was sent to bring him to our shores. Congress, therefore, should decide and direct the mode of receiving and entertaining him, so far as the Government is concerned. Our relations with Austria are of an amicable character at the present time, and if they are to be changed, the responsibility of the conduct which is to produce such a change should rest upon the Legislative branch of the Government. By referring the subject to Congress, the President gets rid of all difficulty arising from the embargo likely to be taken by Austria at the official reception of Kossuth by the United States."

The *Advertiser* is mistaken on one point: it was the President who first invited Kossuth to this country: the action of Congress was subsequent. And now, after having invited him, and in obedience to an order of Congress sent a Government vessel to convey him hither, he fears to receive or treat him as the nation's guest, lest it should give umbrage to Austria!

Well—he shuffles off the responsibility, and lays it upon Congress. What does Congress do? Look at the record of proceedings. A resolution is introduced by Mr. Foote, proposing the appointment of a committee to make appropriate preparations for the reception of the exiled champion of Republicanism. He advocates it with great vehemence, and is sustained by General Cass. But, unexpected opposition from slaveholding members is encountered. Mr. Dawson of Georgia says the resolution is improper—without precedent—Kossuth

is very little about him—he is a Hungarian, to be sure, but not greater than many other men—he is not entitled to any such distinction.

Mr. Hale proposes an amendment—"and that we extend our sympathy to all the victims of oppression throughout the world." This, he thinks, is placing the resolution on the ground of a great principle, and takes off the edge of its application to Austria alone. But the amendment and resolution only develop more rapidly the hostility of the Southern members. Mr. Berrien of Georgia incidentally discloses his opposition, and Mr. Atchison of Missouri betrays a willingness to slur over the resolution.

Mr. Underwood of Kentucky waxes deadly war against it, on the ground specially that it is an interference in foreign affairs—and if Congress may interpose morally in the affairs of foreign States, it may do the same in the affairs of the States of the Union. The doctrine of Intervention was dangerous as a precedent for interference with the domestic institutions of the South. All the speakers unwittingly appeared to concede that slavery in the South was oppression, and therefore Mr. Hale's amendment applied to Southern slaves, as well as to the subjects of foreign oppression.

The discussion was cut short by an adjournment, everybody expecting that the next day would witness a renewal of the debate. That day, that speech of Mr. Underwood was fatal. A change had come over the mover of the resolution, and we fear, over the famous advocate of Non-Intercourse with Austria, Mr. Cass. The Georgia Senators were opposed to the resolution—and our readers are yet to understand that the great aim of certain politicians, now of the National Union party, is to bring the Whigs of Georgia into the Democratic party, to wheel them into the support of Mr. Cass, if possible. The Senate met; Mr. Foote forthwith arose, and withdrew his resolution, alleging as a reason the formidable opposition it had encountered! The first time we ever knew Mr. Foote to yield so tamely to opposition. Ah—had his heart been enlisted in the matter so powerfully, as in his grand scheme for uniting Southern Whigs with the Democratic party, he would not have given up the struggle so easily.

But, there is another point still more serious, to which we would call the attention of the American People. Mr. Bodisco sat close behind the Southern Senators while this discussion was going on, an agonized listener, and we apprehend, from his movements, more than a listener. Mr. Calderon, the Spanish Minister, who, true to his instincts as the servant of Despotism, speaks scornfully of Kossuth, as a low-born Attorney, leaned anxiously over the railing, during the debate, and we have the positive assertion of a gentleman who could not help overhearing, that a foreign minister had an appeal to a member of the House of Representatives, expressing a hope that he would not vote for such a resolution!

This is a new feature in the history of our legislation. We fear it is not the first time that the representatives of Foreign Despotism have interfered with the representatives of the American People. While Conservatives of our country are afraid that the Government should express a generous sentiment, or do a generous act, lest it might give umbrage to Austria or Russia, the Ministers of these Powers seem not to be actuated by the same spirit of forbearance towards us. They may interfere, both with the Administration and Congress, actually, by personal solicitation or admonition, but *silence!* is their command to our Government. This is abominable. Would to God we had an Administration and a Congress that would spurn such intermeddling!

We suppose, then, nothing is to be done. Kossuth has been invited hither by the Government; a national vessel was despatched to convey him; but the moment he lands upon our shores, the President turns the cold shoulder to the Nation's Guest, and Congress, what between slaveholding conservatism and party scheming and the interference of the representatives of European Despotism, will profusely follow his example. Should it refuse to act, Messrs. Bodisco and Hulseman will promptly advise their imperial masters of the submissive temper of our Government; and that, however extravagant the demonstrations of a portion of the People may be, their President, Senators and Representatives, fear the power of the Rulers of Europe much more than they love the rights of the masses.

Which is forever stifling the free spirit of a free People. Were the Queen of Spain driven from her throne by a successful revolution, she would find an asylum at any Court in Europe. The Emperor of Austria would receive her, do her special honor, give her sympathy and support, and not dream that thereby he would give just cause of offence to the new Government of Spain. He would claim the right to honor in her person the Principle of Kosuth, and it would be nobody's business, Kossuth, who drove the Austrians and their savage allies out of Hungary, and who would have established its independence but for the outrageous interposition of Russia, is driven from his country, a martyr in the cause of republicanism.

He comes to our shores, the greatest, purest, most formidable of the European champions of republicanism—the system with which this country is identified—but the Government of the country refuses to receive or recognize him. It is afraid to honor in him the Principle on which our Constitution and institutions rest, lest it should offend the Despotic Powers of Europe!

We hear of Treason against the Government, because a few poor colored men, driven to desperation, resisted in a single instance the enforcement of a single law of the country. The Government itself, if it should refuse to receive Kossuth, will be tried and condemned by the American People, as guilty of high treason against the Cause of the People, not only in this country, but in all countries.

THE UNITED STATES AND EUROPE—FOREIGN RELATIONS.

How shall our example, and the action of our People and Government, be made to aid powerfully, though peacefully, the cause of freedom throughout the world?

Were an Aristocracy enjoying exclusive privileges, established in several of the States of this Union, and tolerated by the Federal Constitution, our example would certainly not be appealed to by the nations of Europe as a conclusive argument in favor of the Democratic Principle. The People might refer to the Democracy of those States excluding aristocracy, but they Oppressors could point triumphantly to the States recognizing it. Especially, should it be known that the aristocracy of these States controlled the national politics and councils of the country, and that no measure of public policy could be adopted without its consent, would the influence of our free institutions generally, in behalf of Freedom abroad, be seriously impaired? for the advocates of Despotism in Europe would point to this fact as proof that the peace, order, and prosperity of our country depended in fact upon the conservative restraints of the Aristocratic Principle.

Now, what is the slaveholding class of the worst kind? For, it monopolizes not only land and capital, but labor. To its possession of exclusive political privileges, it adds the absolute ownership of three millions of laboring people. What privileged order in the world is invested with such power, such mastery as this? The nobility of England possesses land and titles, but, as it respects natural rights, occupies the same level as the masses that wear out their lives in the mines and factories.

With such a privileged order in this Republic, how can its example of Democracy be other than an imperfect one? How greatly must its influence be counteracted by its want of completeness? And, this privileged order exercises a despotic power over our parties; exacts homage from our distinguished statesmen; stamps itself upon our whole system of National Policy; and its prominent representatives claim for it that it is the grand conservative element of the Republic. With what regret must the enlightened friends of Freedom in Europe regard this gross anomaly in our institutions! How it diminishes the force of the argument attempted to be drawn by them from our example, in behalf of Popular Rights!

The elementary principle of European Despotism and American Slavery is the same—the denial of the natural rights of mankind. Not an argument can be adduced in favor of the one, which is not applicable to the other. American slaveholders pronounce the affirmation of the equality of rights among men, contained in our Declaration of Independence, a rhetorical flourish. "Amen!" says Nicholas. "Worse than a rhetorical flourish, it is a damnable heresy," says Pope Pius. Slavery is imbedded in our social system. "Just the same with our Absolute Monarchy," says Nicholas. The slaves are unfit for freedom.

"So are the ignorant masses of Europe," says Pius. Slavery is the conservative of liberty and order. "Exactly so," says Nicholas. "Is Absolute Monarchy—it is the guardian of the liberties of the subject and the pillar of order." The emancipation of the slaves must lead to anarchy and civil war. "Alas, the same dread consequences will result from the emancipation of the masses," says Metternich. It is in the order of Nature and Providence that there should be a superior class for government, and an inferior class for labor—and that the laborer is not qualified to take part in the legislation necessary for his interests, says Chancellor Harper. "Beautifully expressed," responds Metternich—"our American brethren furnish the most cogent arguments for the despotism against which the brutal masses of Europe are forever clamoring."

In fact, American slavery is a powerful ally of European despotism; all the arguments adduced to justify its perpetuation or excuse its toleration, are arguments in support or palliation of European despotism; and so long as this system shall continue to be tolerated among us, to exert a controlling influence over the Government, and to find advocates and apologists, the effect of our example on free institutions must be deplorably weakened in Europe.

The first duty, then, incumbent on every American Republican, anxious to aid the cause of popular freedom in Europe, is to seek earnestly, by all constitutional means, the abolition of slavery, the establishment in his own country of the law of universal freedom, so that it may present a coherent, complete, all-prevailing example of the truth as it benefits the Democratic Principle.

Our next duty is to manifest sympathy with the wrongs of the People of Europe, hatred of Absolutism, opposition to monarchial and aristocratical institutions, approbation of reformatory movements, and of revolution, when necessary to reform; to recognize with gratitude the services of foreigners who have distinguished themselves by their devotion to the rights of mankind; and to grant substantial aid, when required for the support of the cause of popular freedom. We speak now of the People, acting in their individual, not national capacity.

Americans at home should be careful, in their intercourse with foreign tourists, not to indulge in disparaging remarks upon their own institutions, and abroad, should carry their country with them, remembering that they will be taken as representatives of its principles and character. They should be living apostles of Democracy, bearing testimony in all lands against Tyranny, in favor of Republicanism, and upholding the great truths of the Declaration of Independence.

Revolutionary movements abroad, founded on right principles, should be hailed with acclamation by popular assemblies in this country, and sustained, instead of being denounced, by the Press. Kossuth, in his noble address to the People of the United States, bears witness to the new energy inspired in the hearts of his countrymen by the generous enthusiasm with which the Americans hailed their heroic struggle against Austrian despotism. Surely, the opinion and voice of a Republic of twenty-two millions of People, with territory, commerce, wealth, and intelligence, that must secure for it in the course of a few years more, the first position among the nations of the world, cannot be regarded with indifference by either the monarchs or the masses of Europe.

But not to mere expression of opinion and sympathy, should our action be confined. The oppressors of Europe have the wealth, the standing army, the clergy, the resources of all established orders at their command. Though a miserable minority, with such means they are enabled to keep the millions in bondage.

Numbers and intelligence, without organization and means, can effect little against a Government well organized, with a powerful military force at its disposal, and money enough to support it. What the Revolutionists of Europe want is organization and means, and we rejoice that their leaders now clearly understand this. Mazzini, the papers state, with the revolutionary committee of which he is head, has already raised a loan of five millions of dollars, and deposited it in the Bank of England. The mission of Dr. Kinkel to this country is to raise contributions to a similar loan for the purpose of aiding in revolutionizing Germany. A committee organized in London, with branches in this country, is laboring to create a fund of \$2,000,000, to be called the German National Loan, to be made up of individual subscriptions. The committee is composed of exiled patriots of established reputation, who pledge their efforts, should the revolution prove successful, to induce the new Revolutionary Government to recognize this loan as a national debt. Should the revolution fail, of course the contributors will grieve, not for the loss of their investment, but for the failure of the good cause. Conservative papers among us carp at this movement, as they do at every attempt to place our People actively on the side of Human Liberty.

"If the people of Continental Europe," says the *Albany State Register*, "are fitted to sustain the Republic, they will have them. All the armies of emperors and kings cannot prevent them. If, in order to get up a revolution, it is necessary to hire the people to make it, the effort, whatever fine sounding phrases may be used to dignify it, is nothing but brigandage."

Degenerate Americans, inheriting in security the blood of their fathers, have tempted for the oppressed people of Europe, because they do not at once assume their rights. Were they living in Europe, instead of this Republic, they would not have even the spirit to complain of their masters. What could the patriots of 1776 have done, without loans from abroad? Without money, their attempt at revolution would have been a failure. Were the loans they obtained in Europe necessary to hire the people to make a revolution? Our Revolution, then, was nothing but brigandage, and our fathers a gang of brigands, in the judgment of this heartless American!

Money was just as necessary to the attempt of the United Colonies to throw off the British yoke, as it is necessary to the European patriots, in their movements against Absolutism. And yet, had it been possible to consummate a revolution, without foreign loans, the American Colonists were the men to do it. In all important respects they were far more favorably situated than European revolutionists are now. They were separated from their Sovereign by an ocean, which it then required almost as many weeks as it now does days, to pass over. No police army was present to overawe them; no standing army, every movement, every word, and by sudden arrest and incarceration, break the spirit of the people, and prevent concerted action. Besides, they were already organized as self-governing communities, and the whole machinery of government was in fact under their control. With all these favorable circumstances, and backed by the alliance of France, which waged a war with England on her own account, it required seven years' hard fighting to compel the recognition of their independence.

With these facts staring us in the face, is it for us to make light of the obstacles in the way of a successful European Revolution; to sneer at the failures of their champions, as if they afforded evidence of their unfitness for freedom; and to oppose all prudent preparations to insure success, on the ground that whenever the people of Europe shall be qualified for republican institutions, they will have them, kings and emperors, with their standing armies, to the contrary notwithstanding? Just as if the long-established thrones of Europe and their armed legions could be blown away by a breath!

The repeated failure of the People of Europe to overthrow Tyranny is no proof of their unfitness for Freedom or Republican Institutions—no proof that they are not as brave, as intelligent, as aspiring as Americans, but that the obstacles in their way are such as never existed in this country; and it was a damning disgrace to us, who are enjoying a Freedom won not by our labors and sufferings, should we refuse to aid, to the very extent of our ability, the efforts of our brethren in other lands, who have yet to gain their Freedom, and that, too, through such a storm of blood and fire as never beat over the devoted heads of our patriot fathers.

We say, then, give your money—give it as freely as European patriots are prepared to give their blood in the cause of Freedom. It is one way in which you can honor the memory of those who shed their blood for your freedom. It will be an evidence of your devotion to Popular Rights; of your gratitude to the Almighty Ruler of Nations, in whose name the war of the Revolution of 1776 was undertaken, who is ever working for the overthrow of Tyranny, and whose attributes are pledged to sustain every well-directed effort to subvert the Wrong and establish the Right.

And when the hour shall arrive for the decisive struggle between Absolutism and the Popular Cause, we know of no reason why individuals in this country imbued with an ardent love of liberty, if they believe in the righteousness of war waged against Oppression, may not proceed to the theatre of conflict, and do for Freedom in Europe what Lafayette and other generous foreigners did for Freedom in America. The cause of Greece attracted many generous recruits from American Soil. The hour is hastening on when we must be prepared to respond to the far higher claims of the cause of Europe.

We have spoken thus far of our example, and of the modes in which Americans, as individuals, may interfere in behalf of Liberty throughout the world.

In our next number we may have something to say in relation to the duty of the Government.

A NEW VOLUME OF POETRY.—A new volume of Poems, by our correspondent Miss Caroline A. Briggs, will soon be issued by a publishing house in Boston. The poems of this lady published in the *Era* have been copied very extensively.

THE USUAL PRESSURE of long official documents at this season of the year leaves small space for communications. We have on file several communications and some valuable poems which shall appear shortly.

If you would have a constant vigorous health, be temperate.

He that loses his conscience has nothing left that is worth keeping.

For the *National Era*.

KOSUTH.

BY CAROLINE CHESKERO.

The name wherewith to hail him? Shall it be Immortal Magyar? Battle chief? True King? Patriot? Martyr? Statesman? Let us bring. No crown, no sword, no courtly name—for see, He hears a People's voice! Let crowning be! Salute him Prince—High Priest of Sacrifice! Upon his heart a hapless nation lies— He seeks not, needs not praise; let praising be; That tribute meet for vainer men than he Give him your sympathy, your aid—or, tears: But mock not patriot grief with pride's salute: Greet him with blessings, but not revolve; To him 'twere insult—shame, to these dread years! Receive him as Christ's Freedmen should Kossuth!

* Pronounced Koszute.

* Note.—Grace Greenwood's noble thought on the subject. Visit to America suggested my letter. C. C.

THE PROJECT OF DIVIDING CALIFORNIA.

The advocates of a division of California held their Convention at Barba, on the 20th inst. The three counties of San Diego, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara were alone represented. A single individual appeared from Monterey, but the counties of San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz, Santa Clara, Contra Costa, San Francisco, and the several counties of the San Joaquin Valley, all proposed to be included in the new Territory, were unrepresented. Resolutions were passed in favor of seceding from the State, and going back to a Territorial Government; but on the question of drawing the dividing line and locating the capital the diversity of sentiment was so great that no conclusions were arrived at. Divisions prevailed among the few delegates present. Those from San Diego withdrew, refusing to act with the other two counties. The delegation of Los Angeles was divided, and the President seceded from the Convention.

The entire press of San Francisco is against the proposed change. The *Stockton Journal*, edited by an emigrant from a slaveholding State, and the *Times and Transcript*, oppose it. "We have seen in fact," says the *Sonora Herald*, "but one article in any paper, except the *San Diego Herald* and *Los Angeles Star*, in favor of separation, and that was in the *Daily*

The *Stockton Journal* is a paper published in the Southern half of the State is agricultural and the Northern mining and commercial, the same kind of legislation is not adapted to both—that taxes fall unequally upon them, as the principal wealth of the South consists in landed property. The *Sonora Herald* takes occasion from this to suggest that land monopoly is the real source of the burdens of the Southern counties. Immense tracts of land are monopolized by a few thousand proprietors. The *Herald* says if they do not, let them sell their land worth paying taxes on, on their own, and a Yankee and German money rapidly. The sooner the present state of things is done away with the better. The five thousand Mormons who have lately settled here will all make money. They will work on a new system, and with new energy, and instead of wasting time in Division Conventions, resort to that other and better remedy, namely, well-directed industry."

The newspapers opposed to separation are full of denunciations of the schemes of discontented demagogues and politicians, who, they say, are urging on this movement for the sake of multiplying offices for their own benefit. But, they all agree that the formation of a slave State on the Pacific is the chief political element of the agitation. The supporters of this policy are no less bold as they are indefatigable. Disguise is scarcely attempted. They are emissaries chiefly from South Carolina, who, quick as lightning to resist any interference with her domestic institutions, does not hesitate to interfere with those of another State. The *Sonora Herald* is explicit on this point.

Missionaries from South Carolina have been travelling all through the Southern valleys, and industriously working to bring about a secession; in fact, the whole scheme originated not in the Southern counties, but in South Carolina, and among a few slavery propagandists, who had previously endeavored to change the charter of the State, and were expelled by side with cringing slaves, we can never consent, at least without making the struggle required of us as a man. Such we know to be the design of not a few of the prominent actors in the present comic drama. They kept the secret to themselves, but they thought they were strong enough to whisper it among a few friends—Why were they afraid to come out openly, like men, and tell us what they wanted, and let the question be discussed on its real merits? Why try to lug in their Southern neighbors as bruised and dying from maltreatment of thieves and traitors, and make us think themselves their good Samaritans, ready to minister to their comfort?

The *California Courier*, edited by J. M. Crane, who emigrated a year or two ago from Virginia, and who is in favor of division at some future day, is no less explicit: "The most of those in this quarter (San Francisco) who advocate division do so for the purpose of introducing slavery into the Southern division." This testimony is entitled to more consideration from the fact that he has no insuperable objection to the introduction of slavery, provided the people of California shall desire it. The *Stockton Journal*, edited also by an emigrant from a slaveholding State, holds the following language: "There is a question at issue here which has not obtained elsewhere; and which it is absolutely necessary to propagate in this country to give the question anything like interest. We mean the introduction of slavery into the Southern part of the State! This is a delicate subject; but